



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

philosophical views. Those who openly reject it are to have affixed to them the stigma of a term in intention opprobrious.

Quite rightly, as I think, the author insists that if the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the Ascension are no longer to be accepted as miraculous events, Christianity must go. Of course, no one now regards these stories as deliberate falsehoods, least of all the most radical critics, who find their substratum to be mythical; but it is impossible to agree with the reason given for not regarding them as such. "That the story [of the Resurrection] should be a deliberate falsehood is most unlikely, because the leaders of [the infant] Church, though they might not be infallible, were obviously men who would have scorned anything of that kind" (p. 195). Of the leaders of the infant Church we know nothing historically; but that the leaders of the Christian Church as known to history would have scorned falsehood cannot be admitted. Deliberate falsehood, in the shape of forged Sibylline oracles, forged dispatches of Pontius Pilate to Tiberius, etc., was a regular part of the early Christian propaganda; and the most lenient way of putting the case as regards the leaders is that they simply did not care about truth, but only about securing the acceptance of a certain dogma, forgeries being rejected only when they were doctrinally suspect. No heathen opponent of Christianity failed to make the point that the Christians were indifferent to truth.

London, England.

T. WHITTAKER.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D. Vol. V: Dravidians—Fichte. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913. Pp. xvi, 908.

The fifth volume of this Encyclopædia will sustain the reputation made by its predecessors as a treasure-house of learning of all kinds bearing in any way upon the history of ethical and religious origins and development. As usual, the anthropological articles are exceptionally full and valuable, and have the great merit of not expounding the doubtful conjectures of any one man or school as though they were established fact. Specially interesting are the articles on Dress, Drinks (both by the Rev. A. E. Crawley), Education (a composite treatise by several well-known authors), Egyptian Religion (Prof. Flinders Petrie), Eschatology (Canon J. A. MacCulloch, who also disposes ad-

mirably of many absurd ideas which may still be found haunting the work of some who ought to know better, in a briefer article on Druidism), Ethics, Ethics and Morality (this latter virtually an anthropological treatise in itself), Etruscan Religion, Eucharist, Fairy (Canon MacCulloch), Family (another great composite anthropological monograph), and, to my mind, at least, in view of certain tendencies of our own times, that on the Female Principle by Dr. Starbuck. Space precludes mention of the many briefer articles (*e. g.*, that by Professor Kirsopp Lake on Epiphany), which will probably attract the special attention of students primarily interested in Church History. (See also the articles, Ebionites, Elkesaites, Essenes, Expiation and Atonement.) In the composite article on Dreams it was perhaps an oversight on the part of the present writer to pass by the theories of Freud which seem to be 'catching on' everywhere at the present moment. He can only plead that he is not convinced that, so far as the dreams of a normal man are concerned, the hypotheses of Freud really contain much more truth than is expressed in the article in question by the remark that "the cue for the interpretation of our dream-sensations is given by our emotional interests." Among the articles on History of Philosophy may be noted that on Empedocles and that on Epicureans by R. D. Hicks. The former should have pointed out the importance of Empedocles for the early development of Greek medical theory. In the latter it is a pity that no attempt is made to allow for the Academy and Aristotle as influences which have left their mark both on Epicurean Physics and on Epicurean Hedonism. Epicurus's very definition of pleasure is from an Academic source, and his most characteristic position (the theory that pleasure reaches its acme as soon as "uneasiness" is expelled) is hardly explicable except as a deliberate attempt to challenge the pleasure-pain theory of the *Philebus*. It is surely wrong, also, to see in a contemptuous reference to the "Fate of the physicists" a "pointed allusion" to the long-deceased atomists, Leucippus and Democritus. The allusion is made clear by the scornful observation of Epicurus about "astronomers and the fools who admire them." He is thinking of his standing enemies, the Academic men of science, who, in their turn, used their astronomy (as in the *Axiochus*) as a basis for the kind of theology to which Epicurus objected.

The University, St. Andrews.

A. E. TAYLOR.